Further, a Committee of Experts constituted by the Government of India in April, 1990, consisting of Prof. P.V. Indirasan, Dr. C. Rao Kasarbada and Prof. Sampath has given its unanimous report that these machines cannot be tampered. Many Courts including Supreme Court have time and again appreciated the efficiency of EVM in many court cases.

Increase in strength of judges

2202. SHRI NANDI YELLAIAH: Will the Minister of LAW AND JUSTICE be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the Supreme Court had directed the Central and State Governments, in 2005, to increase the strength of judges from 13,000 to 60,000 in five years;

(b) if so, the action taken by Government and the State Governments, so far;

(c) the details of strength of judges throughout the country during 2004-05, 2005-06 and 2006-07, State-wise;

(d) whether it is also a fact that nearly three crore cases are still pending for a long time;

(e) whether Government would assure release of special budget immediately to every State for increasing the strength of judges on a war-footing; and

(f) if not, the reasons therefor?

THE MINISTER OF LAW AND JUSTICE (SHRI H.R. BHARDWAJ): (a) and (b) Information is being collected and will be laid on the Table of the House.

(c) Details of Judge Strength at various High Courts are given in Statement-I *(See* below). With regard to judge strength in District/Subordinate Courts, this Department is not maintaining any data as the matter falls under the purview of the concerned State Government and the High Court. However, as per available information, details of Judge Strength at District/Subordinate Court level as on 1.1.2006 is given in Statement-II *(See* below).

(d) Yes, Sir.

(e) and (f) There is no proposal for release of special budget to any State for supporting increase in judge strength.

Statement-I

Details of Judge strength at various High Courts

Sl. No.	Name of the High Court	Sanctioned Strength as on 1.1.2007	Sanctioned Strength as on 1.1.2006	Sanctioned Strength as on 1.1.2005	Sanctioned Strength as on 1.1.2004
1	2	3	4	5	6
1	Allahabad	95	95	95	72

1	2	3	4	5	.6
2	Andhra Pradesh	39	39	39	39
3	Bombay	61	60	*60*	60
4	Calcutta	50	50	50	48
5	Chhattisgarh	08	OB	06	06
6	Delhi	36	*33*	. 33	32
7	Gauhati	23	19	19	18
8	Gujarat	42	42	42	35
9	Himachal Pradesh	08	06	*08*	08
10	Jammu and Kashmir	14	14	*14*	14
11	Jharkhand	12	12	12	12
12	Karnataka	40	40	40	39
13	Kerala	29	29	29	29
14	Madhya Pradesh	41	41	36	29
15	Madras	45	42	*42*	*42*
16	Orissa	20	20	20	16
17	Patna	31	31	31	27
18	Punjab and Haryana	40	40	40	40
19	Rajasthan	40	40	40	32
20	Sikkim	03	03	OB	03
21	Uttarakhand	09	09	09	07
	TOTAL:	686	675	668	608

Statement-II

Judge strength at district/subordinate court level as on 1.1.2006

SI. No.	Name of the StateAJT	No. of sanctioned Posts	No. of posts Med	No. of vacant posts
1	2	3	4	5
1	Andhra Pradesh	807	768	39
2	Arunachal Pradesh	293	293	0
3	Assam	275	212	*&*
4	Bihar	1163	691	472
5	Chhattisgarh	235	218	17
6	Goa	*44*	27	17
7	Gujarat	826	787	39

1	2 .	3	4	5
8	Haryana	307	230	77
9	Himachal Pradesh	116	111	5
10	Jharkhand	445	415	30
11	Jammu and Kashmir	202	180	22
12	Karnataka	811	673	*138*
13	Kerala	418	395	23
14	Madhya Pradesh	801	695	106
15	Maharashtra	1492 .	1276	216
16	Manipur	34	29	. 5
17	Meghalaya	8	6	2
18	Mizoram	34	18	16
19	Nagaland	25	25	0
20	Orissa	477	425	52
21	Punjab	328	256	72
22	Rajasthan	792	686	106
23	Sikkim	13	10	3
24	Tamil Nadu	757	727	30
25	Tripura	75	61	14
26	Uttar Pradesh	2172	1424	748
27	West Bengal	706	596	*110*
28	Uttaranchal	200	101	99
	TOTAL: (A)	13856	11335	2521
	Union Territories			
1	Delhi	392	266	. 126
2	Pondicherry	21	17	4
3	Chandigarh.	20	18	2
4	Andman and Nicobar Island	8	8	*0*
5	Lakshadweep Island	3	2	*1*
6	Daman and Diu	3	2	1
7	Dadra and Nagar Haveli	2	2	0
	TOTAL: (B)	449	315	134
	TOTAL: (A+B)	14305	11650	2655